u

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,614	09/05/2003	Anthony Robert Wicks	M0274.70033US00	7995

23628   7590   08/23/2006
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, PC
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2206

EXAMINER
PATEL, MANGLESH M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/656,614	WICKS, ANTHONY ROBERT
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Manglesh M. Patel	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *amendment (May 30, 2006)*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This **Non-Final** action is responsive to the amendment filed on May 30, 2006.

2.   Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, 2 and 19 are independent claims.

Withdrawn Objections

3.   The objection to claim 20 has been withdrawn in light of the amendment.

Withdrawn Rejections

4.   The 35. U.S.C. 112 rejection of claims 3, 4 and 8 has been withdrawn in light of the amendment.

5.   The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 1, 12-13, 15-16 and 19 with cited references of Gotz U.S. Pub2004/0034699 in view of Arend U.S. Pub2003/0229848 further in view of Sangay (NPL, Microsoft Excel 2000: Formatting Colors) further in view of Excel Printout by Examiner (1999) has been withdrawn in light of the amendment and persuasive arguments.

6.   The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of claims 2-11, 14, 17-18 and 20 with cited references of Gotz U.S. Pub2004/0034699 in view of Arend U.S. Pub2003/0229848 has been withdrawn in light of the amendment and persuasive arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis (NPL, Application Development Methodology, Dec 1996, pgs 1-20) in view of Labarge (U.S. Pub 2002/0120604, filed Feb 27, 2001).

Regarding Independent claim 1, Davis teaches a computer-implemented method of managing information correlating a separate list of items and a list of attributes comprising: Displaying the list of items as a column of rows, each row displaying the name of an item in the list of items (page 9, wherein a column of rows including the item name is shown

in a list); Displaying to the side of the column a set of vertical strips extending the length of the column, each strip being associated with a different attribute of the list of attributes (page 9, wherein a strip of attributes are adjacent to the column of rows); Displaying markers in the strips at selected positions where the strips cross rows, said positions being selected in accordance with whether the item named in the crossed row has (or alternatively has not) the attribute associated with that strip (page 9, wherein the strip includes markers at selected positions and these strips cross rows); Wherein the <u>vertical</u> strips extend beyond the column of rows of items and have horizontal extensions themselves forming a column of rows, each row displaying the name of an attribute in the list of attributes (page 9, wherein the strips extend beyond the column of rows and include horizontal extensions that form a column of rows and each displays the name of an attribute); <u>Wherein the method further comprises storing the name of each item in the list of items and information identifying the attributes of each item</u> (page 9, wherein the item and information for the attributes of that item are stored within the table); Davis does not explicitly show the filter option associated with the attributes. Davis does show a key with different colors representing the markers used in the attribute strips. Labarge teaches <u>Wherein the horizontal extension of each attribute strip further displays a filter option indicator</u> (fig 3a & paragraphs 30-34, wherein a check box is used to represent the filter option indicator); <u>Wherein the method further comprises receiving user input to select at least one filter option, storing the selected filter options and displaying the or each corresponding filter option indicator</u> (fig 3a & paragraphs 30-34, wherein a check box is used to represent the filter option indicator and is stored in response to user input); <u>Filtering the list of items according to the or each filter option selected by the user, and redisplaying the filtered list of items in the column of rows and the associated markers in the selected positions of the strips</u> (paragraphs 34-37, wherein after the changes are made the filter includes a refresh button to re-filter the items). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify Davis table by including a filter option for the attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user an option by allowing the user to (select or de-deselect) the attribute to apply to an entire column, thereby saving time. Saving time because the user doesn't have to go thru every single strip and deselect one by one each marker in that column for that attribute, instead they could just select the one filter box associated with the attribute.

Regarding Independent claims 2 and 20, Davis discloses a computer-implemented method of managing data elements in a computer system, each data element having at least one associated attribute, the method comprising: Storing identifiers of each data element and information identifying the attributes of each data element (page 9, wherein the identifiers are listed in the column for each data element identifying each of the processes. The chart also includes information identifying the attributes for the data elements of the entity type); Displaying a marker in the attribute

marker section of each attribute strip if the data element possesses the attribute associated with that attribute strip based

on the stored data (page 9, wherein the table includes a marker for identifying each attribute in the strip); Displaying

identifiers associated with each of the data elements in a list as a column of rows, displaying a set of attribute strips

extending along at least one side of the column of rows, each attribute strip being associated with a possible attribute

for the data element, wherein each attribute strip has a first section containing an identifier of a possible attribute of a

data element, a second section comprising a filter option indicator and wherein each attribute strip further comprises

attribute marker sections for each data element (page 9, wherein the column of rows include strips adjacent to it

describing the attributes that include a first section for identifying the attribute); Davis fails to explicitly teach the

second section containing a filter option associated with the attribute. Labarage teaches receiving user input to select at

least one filter option (fig 3a & paragraphs 30-34, wherein a check box is used to represent the filter option indicator

and is stored in response to user input); Storing the selected filter options and displaying the or each corresponding

filter option indicator (fig 3a & paragraphs 30-34, wherein a check box is used to represent the filter option indicator

and is stored/displayed in response to user input); Filtering the data elements according to the or each filter option

selected by the user (paragraphs 34-37, wherein after the changes are made the filter includes a refresh button to re-

filter the items); Redisplaying the filtered data elements in the column of rows and the associated markers in the

attribute marker section of each attribute strip (paragraphs 34-37, wherein after the changes are made the filter includes

a refresh button to re-filter the items). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

to modify Davis table by including a filter option for the attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to

provide the user an option by allowing the user to (select or de-deselect) the attribute to apply to an entire column,

thereby saving time. Saving time because the user doesn't have to go thru every single strip and deselect one by one

each marker in that column for that attribute, instead they could just select the one filter box associated with the

attribute.

Regarding Dependent claim 3, with dependency of claim 2, Davis fails to explicitly teach a filter option. Labarge

teaches wherein data elements <u>are selectively</u> filtered <u>based</u> on the presence or on the absence of a selected attribute

(fig 3a & paragraphs 30-34, wherein the items in the list are filtered according to the selection made in the filter box).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify Davis table by including a

filter option for the attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user an option by allowing

the user to (select or de-deselect) the attribute to apply to an entire column, thereby saving time. Saving time because

the user doesn't have to go thru every single strip and deselect one by one each marker in that column for that attribute,

instead they could just select the one filter box associated with the attribute.

Regarding Dependent claim 4, with dependency of claim 2, Davis fails to explicitly teach a filter option. Labarge teaches wherein the data elements are filtered using a combination of positively or negatively selected attributes (fig 3a & paragraphs 30-34, wherein either the box is selected or de-selected to apply the filtering, therefore it includes a positively or negatively selected attribute). At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify Davis table by including a filter option for the attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user an option by allowing the user to (select or de-deselect) the attribute to apply to an entire column, thereby saving time. Saving time because the user doesn't have to go thru every single strip and deselect one by one each marker in that column for that attribute, instead they could just select the one filter box associated with the attribute.

Regarding Dependent claim 5, with dependency of claim 2, Davis teaches storing information indicating whether each data element possesses each attribute (page 9, wherein the marker itself is stored and indicated weather the data element posses the attribute).

Regarding Dependent claim 6, with dependency of claim 2, Davis teaches wherein the attribute marker sections of the attribute strips are provided at the intersection between each attribute strip and each row in the column of rows (page 9, wherein the marker section is at the intersection between the strip and the row in the column of rows).

Regarding Dependent claim 7, with dependency of claim 2, Davis teaches allowing a user to select or deselect an attribute for a data element (page 9, wherein the chart shows the selected and de-selected attributes applied to the individual data elements).

Regarding Dependent claim 8, with dependency of claim 7, Davis teaches wherein the attributes are selected or deselected by setting the marker on or off in the attribute marker section at the intersection of the data element row and the attribute column (page 9, wherein the markers include a on or off setting, either applying by C-creating or leaving it blank with no effects).

Regarding Dependent claim 9, with dependency of claim 2, Davis teaches storing a first table separately from the data

elements, wherein the table comprises an identifier of each attribute and a filtering flag indicating whether the attribute

has been selected for filtering (page 9 wherein the table for the attribute is separate from the data items). Davis fails to

explicitly teach a filtering flag associated with the attribute. Labarge teaches the use of a filtering option to have those

data items effected by the attributes (fig 3a & paragraphs 30-34). At the time of the invention it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify Davis table by including a filter option for the attributes. The motivation for

doing so would have been to provide the user an option by allowing the user to (select or de-deselect) the attribute to

apply to an entire column, thereby saving time. Saving time because the user doesn't have to go thru every single strip

and deselect one by one each marker in that column for that attribute, instead they could just select the one filter box

associated with the attribute.

Regarding Dependent claim 10, with dependency of claim 2, Davis discloses providing a second table for storing

information associated with the data elements wherein the table comprises a pointer to each data element and an

attribute flag for each attribute in the first table showing whether the attribute is on or off (page 9, wherein a separate

table or key table includes a pointer to each data elements attribute flag).

Regarding Dependent claim 11, with dependency of claim 2, Davis discloses wherein the attribute strips are arranged

vertically down at least one side of the column of rows (page 9, wherein the strips are vertically down one side of the

column of rows).

Regarding Dependent claim 12, with dependency of claim 2, Davis discloses wherein the attribute strips have

horizontal extensions, a plurality of the horizontal extensions forming a second column of rows, wherein the horizontal

extension of each attribute strip includes the first section containing the attribute identifier and the second section

containing the filter option indicator (page 9, wherein the strips include horizontal extensions for the attributes). Davis

fails to explicitly teach a filtering flag associated with the attribute. Labarge teaches the use of a filtering option to have

those data items effected by the attributes (fig 3a & paragraphs 30-34). At the time of the invention it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify Davis table by including a filter option for the attributes. The motivation for

doing so would have been to provide the user an option by allowing the user to (select or de-deselect) the attribute to

apply to an entire column, thereby saving time. Saving time because the user doesn't have to go thru every single strip

and deselect one by one each marker in that column for that attribute, instead they could just select the one filter box

associated with the attribute.

Regarding Dependent claim 13, with dependency of claim 2, Davis discloses wherein each attribute strip is mutually visibly distinct (page 9, wherein the key includes different colors for the marker being applied to that data element. Therefore the markers that represent the attributes in the strip include color information and are mutually visibly distinct).

Regarding Dependent claim 14, with dependency of claim 2, Davis discloses providing a plurality of sets of attribute strips associated with a plurality of sets of attributes and providing selection means for a user to select one or more sets of attribute strips to be displayed (page 9, wherein multiple strips associated with the attributes are provided in the table and include a selection of different sets of strips).

Regarding Dependent claim 15, with dependency of claim 14, Davis discloses wherein seven attribute strips are provided for each page of attributes (page 10, wherein seven strips are provided for each attribute page).

Regarding Dependent claim 16, with dependency of claim 15, Davis teaches wherein the seven attribute strips are colored in a rainbow of colors (page 10, wherein the strips are indicated by the markers represented by color information according to the key).

Regarding Dependent claim 17, with dependency of claim 2, Davis teaches receiving user input to create a new attribute and assign the new attribute to selected data elements (page 10, wherein the table can include multiple entries which is design choice and dependent on the amount of data to be input).

Regarding Dependent claim 18, with dependency of claim 2, Davis teaches wherein identifiers of data elements that are not installed are displayed (page 10, wherein the identifiers of the data that are not installed are displayed and indicated with a read only option in the attribute strips).

Regarding Independent claim 19, Davis teaches a computer-implemented method for displaying a filterable list of items, the method comprising: Displaying the list of items as a column of rows, each row displaying various information pertaining to the item, this column being enclosed by a set of horizontal differently colored strips set one above the other across the top and a matching set of vertical colored strips down one or both sides, each vertical strip

forming a right-angle with its correspondingly colored horizontal strip, together forming a rectangular approximation to a rainbow (page 9, wherein a column of rows including the item name is shown in a list with a strip adjacent to it representing the attributes being applied to that item); Davis fails to teach a filter box associated with the attributes. Labarge teaches displaying in each or some of the horizontal colored strips the name of an attribute that the items in the list may possess, as well as an option box to allow filtering of the list on the presence or absence of the attribute (fig 3a & paragraphs 30-34, wherein a check box is used to represent the filter option indicator and is stored in response to user input); Davis teaches Using each rectangle formed by the intersection of a vertical colored strip and a horizontal item row to display a marker if the item possesses the attribute shown in the corresponding horizontal colored strip (page 9, wherein markers are associated with the different attributes by placing them in the strips adjacent to the data items); Further using this rectangle, where the user is allowed to set the attribute, to accept a mouse click from the user to toggle the attribute on or off for the item (page 9, wherein the user inputs the marker in the strip and includes an off or on position); Davis fails to teach a filter box associated with the attributes. Labarge teaches allocating a first table separately from the items to be listed, each element to contain an attribute name and a flag indicating whether the attribute has been selected for filtering, and if so whether positively or negatively (fig 3a & paragraphs 30-34, wherein either the box is selected or de-selected to apply the filtering, therefore it includes a positively or negatively selected attribute); Davis teaches allocating a second table for storing as many elements as there are items to be listed, each element containing a pointer to the item, as well as a flag for each attribute in the first table showing whether the attribute is on or off (page 9, wherein a separate table from the data items is used with markers that are associated to the attributes and include an on or off indication); Initializing the first table with attribute names (page 9, wherein the first table includes attribute names); Generating entries in the second table for each item to be listed (page 9, wherein the second table includes the data items); Davis fails to teach a filter box associated with the attributes. Labarge teaches updating the filtering flags in the first table according to input from the user (paragraphs 34-37, wherein after the changes are made the filter includes a refresh button to re-filter the items); Updating the attribute flags in the second table according to input from the user (paragraphs 34-37, wherein after the changes are made the filter includes a refresh button to re-filter the items); Displaying the attributes together with the list of items or a subset thereof according to the two tables (paragraphs 34-37, wherein after the changes are made the filter includes a refresh button to re-filter the items. Wherein updating includes listing the information from the two tables). Although Davis doesn't explicitly mention the colored strips it would have been obvious to include different colored strips for different data items. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to make the distinction between the corresponding data item and attributes thereby making it easier to identify the attribute with its respective data item.

Further at the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to modify Davis table by

including a filter option for the attributes. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user an option

by allowing the user to (select or de-deselect) the attribute to apply to an entire column, thereby saving time. Saving

time because the user doesn't have to go thru every single strip and deselect one by one each marker in that column for

that attribute, instead they could just select the one filter box associated with the attribute.

It is noted that any citation [[s]] to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any

interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it

contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

[[See, MPEP 2123]]

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments filed May 30, 2006 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground of

rejection.

Conclusion

Other Prior Art Cited

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Nishikawa et al. (U.S. Pub 2005/0108748) discloses "Display Filter Criteria And Results Display Apparatus And Method"
- Baynger (U.S. Pub 2004/0032432) discloses "Multi-Dimensional Table Filtering System"
- Guerlain et al. (U.S. 6,587,108) discloses "Multivariable Process Matrix Display And Methods Regarding Same"
- Sutton (U.S. 6,745,140) discloses "Electronic Test System With Test Result View Filter"

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to

Manglesh M. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-5937. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W 6 am-3 pm T,

TH 6 am-2pm, Fr 9am-6pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen

S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or

Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact

the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manglesh M. Patel
Patent Examiner
August 16, 2006

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER